



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

THOMAS SHADWELL'S "LIBERTINE". A COMPLEMENTARY STUDY TO THE DON JUAN LITERATURE. By Dr. August Steiger. (Untersuchungen zur neueren Sprach-und Literatur-geschichte, herausg. v. Oskar F. Walzel. V. Heft). Berne; Francke. 1904. pp. viii, 66.

Much of the literary activity in Germany (and German Switzerland) is, if not actually wasted, at least misdirected. As long as so many graver problems of English literature remain unattempted, it seems a pity to waste seventy odd pages over such a paltry performance as Shadwell's *Libertine*. The Restoration drama in general is sorry stuff at the best and Shadwell represents that drama at its worst. Steiger can scarcely be acquainted with Dryden's *Mac Flecknoe* and the stinging souplet:

The rest to some faint meaning make pretence,  
But Shadwell never deviates into sense.

True, the Don Juan legend is now coming to the front; witness the recent study by G. G. de Bevoite, *La Légende de Don Juan; son Evolution dans la Littérature des Origines au Romantisme*. Yet Shadwell's contribution to its vogue is of the slightest and might be disposed of in half a dozen pages. Steiger's research may be summed up in a few words, to the effect that Shadwell borrowed his theme not from Molière but from Rosimond's *Le nouveau Festin de Pierre*. Both Molière and Rosimond were at least endowed with *esprit*; Shadwell's "pot boiler", for it is nothing more, is what Steiger would call a "grossification" of the theme. Why not call it a brutalization? At one point, certainly, Steiger has lost his bearings. At p. 6 he remarks: "In this great mass of Don Juan poetry *English literature* takes a very poor place. Before and after *Shadwell's 'Libertine'* there is scarcely anything to be mentioned, etc." Has the word *dramatic* dropped out before *literature*? Let us hope so. Otherwise what becomes of Byron's *Don Juan*, which Goethe pronounced the greatest poem of the nineteenth century? Though not to the manner born, Steiger has written his work in English. Hence more than one curious expression. For example, "congruity" for "point of agreement" will scarcely pass; no more will "ought-to be witty", p. 10, for "would-be witty." "Seductive attempts", p. 40, for "attempts at seduction," is flatly non-English. Throughout, the reader is fretted with the suspicion that the author is writing in one idiom and thinking another. What is meant by the phrase "typical not only for his superior", p. 30, I fail to divine.

By an odd coincidence, Shadwell's *Libertine* has also been the subject of a doctoral dissertation by Oskar Reihmann, Leipzig, 1904. The two writers have evidently worked in ignorance each of the other's labours and the two arrive at pretty much the same conclusions and in about the same number of pages. Reihmann expresses himself in straightforward normal German, and his style is free from ungainly attempts such as Steiger's to be ironical. Otherwise there is little to choose between the two studies.

J. M. HART.

*Cornell University.*

---

NÅGRA ANMÄRKNINGAR OM DE NORDISKA VERBEN  
MED MEDIAGEMINATA, af Elof Hellquist. Göteborgs  
Högskolas Årsskrift, Göteborg, 1908.

This article, which tries to show that long voiced stops were used in Pregermanic as a formative element to give an iterative or intensive force, is in reality an attack on von Friesen's work *Om de Germanska Mediageminatorna*, Upsala, 1897.

Not to mention other valuable results, von Friesen had shown that the long voiced stop is Pregermanic (not only Westgermanic), that it appears only in the case of substantive *n*-stems and verbs derived from these, and that it is the result of the lengthening of a voiced spirant before this *-n* after the voiced stops had already become voiceless. Hellquist, on the other hand, does not believe that any *-n* enters into the problem, but that the formations are "kortnamn, barnord, onomatopoetica".

Verbs with long voiced stop were explained by von Friesen as denominatives to these *n*-stems. Hellquist argues that they are in many cases merely onomatopoetic formations. He also discusses along these lines a number of verbs with long voiced stops not treated in the article "Om de Germanska Mediageminatorna".

Von Friesen had accounted for the absence in Gothic of words of this type by pointing out that also the Swedish Bible of 1541 contains no traces of such forms. The reason is that the words in question belong in most cases to the colloquial language. Hellquist now asks: "Why do they?" He attempts to answer this question.

Through lists arranged according to the meaning of the words concerned, our author shows that the greater number of these refer to noise of some kind. He thinks, then, that the